

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION AT CLEVELAND

-----X  
IN RE: : Case No. 1:17-md-2804  
:   
NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION : (Pages 1 - 26)  
OPIATE LITIGATION :   
: December 1, 2023  
:   
-----X

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE  
HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN AARON POLSTER  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Official Court Reporter:

Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR, CRC  
Realtime Systems Administrator  
United States District Court  
801 West Superior Avenue  
Court Reporters 7-189  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
216-357-7078  
donnalee\_cotone@ohnd.uscourts.gov

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript  
produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 APPEARANCES:

2  
3 For Plaintiffs' Executive Committee (PEC):

4 **PETER H. WEINBERGER, ESQ.**  
5 Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber LLP  
6 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Suite 1700  
7 1900 East Ninth Street  
8 Cleveland, OH 44114  
9 216-696-323

10 For OptumRx, Inc:

11 **BRIAN D. BOONE, ESQ.**  
12 Alston & Bird LLP  
13 Suite 300  
14 Vantage South End  
15 1120 South Tryon Street  
16 Charlotte, NC 28203-6818  
17 704-444-1106

18 For Express Scripts:

19 **PATRICK J. KING, ESQ.**  
20 Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart &  
21 Sullivan LLP  
22 Suite 500  
23 711 Louisiana Street  
24 Houston, TX 77002  
25 713-221-7222

ALSO PRESENT:

David Cohen, Special Master

- - - - -

1 MORNING SESSION, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2023

2 (Proceedings commenced at 8:32 a.m.)

3 - - -

4 THE COURT: All right. Good morning.

08:32:16 5 Do we have everyone on that we need?

6 JUDICIAL ASSISTANT: It's difficult to take  
7 attendance because there's so many. But they will identify  
8 themselves before they talk. And the court reporter is on.

9 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, this is a  
08:32:32 10 telephonic status conference in the Opioid MDL with the  
11 lawyers involved in the four PBM bellwethers.

12 The parties have submitted proposed case management  
13 orders. They agree on some things, disagree on a number of  
14 them. Before I just decide what we're going to do, I  
08:32:54 15 thought it would be helpful to have a conversation. I've  
16 got a few questions, and then I'll let people speak.

17 All right. The first question I have, lawyers for the  
18 PBMs had said some time ago they plan to file motions to  
19 disqualify some plaintiffs' counsel in these bellwethers.

08:33:24 20 Is that still something under consideration, and if  
21 so, I'm going to set a very prompt, you know, schedule to  
22 file those and have responses and replies.

23 MR. BOONE: Your Honor, this is Brian Boone  
24 from Alston & Bird for OptumRx.

08:33:39 25 The answer is yes, we still intend to move to

1 disqualify certain counsel and stand ready to do so on your  
2 schedule.

3 THE COURT: All right. Well, look, Brian,  
4 this is -- I strongly suggest -- I don't know, are -- if  
08:33:54 5 clients are on. I think in the future -- if they're not, I  
6 think in the future anytime I have a conference or a  
7 hearing, we should have client reps from both sides. This  
8 should be a decision your clients make because there will be  
9 ramifications if you file this motion -- or these motions,  
08:34:18 10 whatever I end up doing.

11 I've been managing this litigation for, I don't know,  
12 at least almost six years, and it only works -- we've got  
13 the best lawyers in the country. It only works if the  
14 lawyers can at the same time vigorously represent their  
08:34:41 15 clients, but also cooperate in moving this litigation  
16 forward. And we've been able to do that.

17 Your clients need to understand if they file these  
18 motions, it will be very difficult to maintain that level of  
19 professional cooperation, and that will clearly have  
08:35:08 20 negative repercussions for your clients. I don't need to  
21 spell it out. But if they're not listening, you ought to  
22 explain to them exactly what I mean.

23 MR. BOONE: Understood, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: We just went through, in my  
08:35:25 25 opinion, a needless exercise that just consumed private

1 resources and judicial resources. So they should think long  
2 and hard before filing these motions. If they do, we'll  
3 deal with them. They're not going to delay this case one  
4 iota. We'll be litigating that alongside of litigating the  
08:35:49 5 merits of the case. And all the lawyers you're seeking to  
6 disqualify will be litigating and doing whatever they need  
7 to do. We're not going to delay, you know, how these court  
8 case are going to proceed by one minute. And all it's going  
9 to do is make everything that everyone needs to do a lot  
08:36:08 10 more difficult and complicated in the months ahead. But  
11 that's your decision to make, so --

12 MR. KING: Judge --

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 MR. KING: Judge, sorry. This is Patrick King  
08:36:19 15 for Express Scripts.

16 Just for the record, on behalf of Express Scripts, as  
17 things currently stand, we don't intend to file any motions  
18 for disqualification, but would reserve our right to do so  
19 later based upon new information.

20 THE COURT: All right. Well --

21 MR. BOONE: And, Judge, this is Brian Boone  
22 again for OptumRx.

23 Understood. I'll pass along your message. I'm not  
24 sure if the client rep is on this morning.

08:36:46 25 And just to give you some sense, we're not intending

1 to move to disqualify the entire PEC. For instance, we  
2 would move to disqualify certain counsel who we think have  
3 clear, ethical conflicts. So -- and we understand that  
4 we're going to be litigating apace alongside those motions.

08:37:03 5 THE COURT: All right. Well, again, I think,  
6 Brian, you should really discuss this with your client,  
7 particularly since the other defendant is not joining,  
8 whether this is a wise thing to do.

9 All right. This is what I'm going to do. If -- only  
08:37:19 10 motions to disqualify are to be filed by two weeks from  
11 today. That's the 15th. I'm not suggesting -- in fact, I'm  
12 encouraging you not to, but if you're going to file them,  
13 that's the deadline.

14 Given the holiday, I'll give the plaintiffs longer  
08:37:42 15 than normal to respond.

16 Why don't -- how's January the 10th to respond?

17 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this is  
18 Pete Weinberger.

19 That's fine for us.

08:38:07 20 THE COURT: All right. And then I'll give ten  
21 days for reply, which would be January the 20th. And, you  
22 know, there may need to be discovery, and if so, we'll map  
23 that out. I'll -- I guess that will depend on what the  
24 plaintiffs say in their response. But you should address  
08:38:29 25 whether, you know, you think you need discovery and what

1 that would be. And I typically -- if I think there's any  
2 question whether discovery is needed to decide a motion,  
3 I'll usually allow it, so . . .

4 Okay. All right.

08:38:45 5 JUDICIAL ASSISTANT: Judge, are you expecting  
6 these deadlines to be at noon or at the end of the business  
7 day?

8 THE COURT: Yeah, let's make it at noon.  
9 That's probably a good idea for everything.

08:39:01 10 All right. The second thing, it would be helpful for  
11 me to know. I know the plaintiffs are going to -- we need  
12 to set a deadline for filing amended complaints. Whether  
13 the -- I don't know if the parties specifically addressed  
14 that.

08:39:21 15 When are the plaintiffs planning to file -- I assume  
16 you are filing amended complaints. When do you -- well, it  
17 would be a motion for leave to file, all right?

18 I've already said, you know, I'm going to allow the  
19 filing of amended complaints. Whether I'll allow any  
08:39:37 20 particular amendments depends on the objections. I'll have  
21 to rule on them. But we'll do it with formality.

22 When are you going to file your motion for leave to  
23 amend and attach the amended complaints?

24 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, Pete Weinberger,  
08:39:51 25 again.

1 December 15th.

2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I don't know,  
3 maybe I'll set the same schedule -- the same schedule for  
4 the other -- the other seems as good as anything. So we'll  
08:40:10 5 make it -- unless the PBMs think that's not enough time.  
6 You tell me.

7 This would be objecting -- what I want to see is  
8 objection to the contents of the amendments. I guess you  
9 can in effect -- the literal fact that they're amending, but  
08:40:33 10 in my opinion, the Sixth Circuit has already made clear that  
11 amendments are permitted -- some amendments are permitted  
12 for bellwethers.

13 MR. BOONE: This is Brian Boone again,  
14 Your Honor, for OptumRx.

08:40:44 15 That makes sense to me, the schedule that you  
16 proposed. So that would mean that our oppositions would be  
17 due January the 10th; is that right?

18 THE COURT: Right. Right. If that's okay,  
19 we'll be -- it will be easier. Everyone can remember the  
08:40:56 20 same dates. So noon on December 15th; January 10th the  
21 responses; replies, January 20th. And then I'll work on  
22 them.

23 I assume the plaintiffs have a pretty good idea of  
24 what cause or cause of action they're going to allege. It  
08:41:19 25 might be helpful if we know that. If you haven't decided,



1 well, then, we'll wait to see the amended complaints,  
2 proposed amended complaints.

3 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, we're still in  
4 the drafting stage.

08:41:35 5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MR. WEINBERGER: And they're working  
7 diligently on that. And so I would hesitate to --

8 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

9 MR. WEINBERGER: -- to make a presentation.

08:41:45 10 THE COURT: All right. Then it was more a  
11 question.

12 Well, the one thing -- the one critical issue that I'm  
13 sure we're going to have to address if the -- if the  
14 plaintiffs are proposing to add what I'm going to call  
08:42:15 15 dispensing, pharmacy dispensing claims, the kind of claims  
16 that we had in Track 3 against Walmart, Walgreens, CVS,  
17 inadequate suspicious order monitoring systems, that was the  
18 heart of the pharmacy bellwether trial.

19 I know these PBMs both operate mail-order pharmacies  
08:42:38 20 as part of their business. The current complaints against  
21 them don't allege anything with respect to their mail-order  
22 pharmacy business.

23 I really do not want, and never envisioned that these  
24 bellwethers against the PBMs would turn into pharmacy -- to  
08:43:00 25 replicate the pharmacy trials.

1 I'm concerned that if the plaintiffs add those claims,  
2 the defendants are going to want to bring in as third-party  
3 defendants all of the pharmacies, the major pharmacies.  
4 Those three have already entered into global settlements  
08:43:21 5 nationwide, and maybe many others, and the trial is going to  
6 be unworkable or unmanageable.

7 So I just want the plaintiffs to think about that.  
8 And if you're proposing to do that, you've got to put in  
9 your filing why it's essential to do it and how you would  
08:43:43 10 propose to manage the trial. Because I have great -- I  
11 really don't think it's -- I think it potentially could make  
12 the trials unmanageable. And that doesn't serve anyone's  
13 purpose. So that's something for the plaintiffs to think  
14 about.

08:44:04 15 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, can I just  
16 respond for a second? This is Pete Weinberger again.

17 THE COURT: Yes. Yes.

18 MR. WEINBERGER: Yes. We're looking at that  
19 issue very seriously, and just to clarify for the record, it  
08:44:17 20 has to do with the -- not so much with suspicious  
21 monitoring, suspicious order monitoring, which is really a  
22 distribution type claim. But rather, it has to do with  
23 their corresponding responsibility under the CSA as a  
24 dispenser.

08:44:36 25 And, of course, as the Court is aware, there have been

1 discussions in the past with the Court and with the parties  
2 about the issue of a duty. What is the duty of the PBMs and  
3 their knowledge through their dispensing practices of their  
4 corresponding responsibility, and what was happening in this  
08:45:04 5 country with respect to dispensing issues associated with  
6 all the dispensers goes to their -- to their knowledge, and  
7 the foreseeability of their conduct as a whole as PBMs. I  
8 don't mean --

9 THE COURT: Well, that's a separate question.

08:45:23 10 I just want to -- I don't want to interrupt, but  
11 that's a separate question, and there would be an ability to  
12 conduct discovery pertaining to dispensing practices -- with  
13 respect to knowledge learned without actually alleging that  
14 the PBMs dispensing practices themselves either were part of  
08:45:48 15 a RICO conspiracy or contributed to a public nuisance or  
16 whatever other theory the plaintiffs have. All right?

17 I understand that knowledge obtained through a portion  
18 of their -- of their business can go -- you know, knowledge  
19 is knowledge, and it can go to other aspects of what they  
08:46:10 20 do. That's different than specifically alleging -- well, as  
21 we had in Track 3, that the pharmacies breached their duty  
22 of care and their corresponding duty with respect to every  
23 time you fill a prescription. And the pharmacist has a  
24 corresponding duty with the medical professional on each and  
08:46:35 25 every prescription that's dispensed. That was the heart of

1 the Track 3.

2 So, again, that's something that you should think  
3 about when you're drafting it. I am just concerned that if  
4 there are specific claims, dispensing claims, breach of a  
08:46:52 5 corresponding duty when the PBMs dispensed all their  
6 millions of prescriptions, we're going to -- this is going  
7 to morph back into Track 3, and it potentially would be  
8 unworkable. So that's just something to think about.

9 MR. BOONE: Your Honor, this is Brian Boone  
08:47:13 10 again from Alston Bird for OptumRx.

11 You're right. And if the plaintiffs want to add  
12 dispensing claims against the PBMs mail-order pharmacies, we  
13 will want to bring in other pharmacies as defendants. And  
14 that's going to be a whole lot of complication for no  
08:47:29 15 payoff. Because I can tell you -- and I'm speaking for  
16 OptumRx here. I don't have the exact numbers, but we're  
17 talking about maybe a .3 percent market share. Not  
18 3 percent, .3 percent. We're talking about hundreds of  
19 prescriptions, not thousands, over the course of a decade.  
08:47:44 20 So not the millions that you were envisioning.

21 MR. KING: And Your Honor, this is Patrick  
22 King for Express Scripts.

23 Similarly, we have less than 1 percent market share in  
24 each of these bellwether jurisdictions. And just by way of  
08:48:00 25 example, in the city of Rochester, there are dozens of

1 pharmacies with larger market share than the Express  
2 Scripts' mail-order pharmacies.

3 So I think the problem here you flagged is that by  
4 including dispensing claims, it would dramatically expand  
08:48:17 5 the scope of these bellwethers.

6 THE COURT: Well, and that's -- I envision  
7 that, and I'm not sure that's a wise thing to do. But,  
8 again, they -- if they're -- even if we don't have formal  
9 dispensing claims in the case, that doesn't mean the  
08:48:39 10 plaintiffs can't get discovery as to what the PBMs did as  
11 mail-order pharmacies, and what they may have learned while  
12 they were doing it, and whether that knowledge bears on  
13 other claims.

14 So I see that -- I see this as two distinct issues.  
08:48:59 15 One is formal claims in the case, and the second is the  
16 scope of discovery. So that's just --

17 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this is  
18 Peter Weinberger.

19 Not to prolong this discussion, -- and we certainly  
08:49:18 20 will address this for our motion for leave -- I just want to  
21 remind the Court that in CT3, in Track 3, as well as in some  
22 of the other litigation, we've addressed the fault of  
23 nonparties. If you recall, in CT3, you allowed evidence in  
24 about market shares associated with independent pharmacies  
08:49:42 25 without bringing them in as defendants.

1           And then the other point I want to make is that --  
2           and, you know, I think this is down the road once you make a  
3           ruling on the amended complaints -- is that this information  
4           that they're providing you about their -- the number of  
08:50:05 5           scripts that they actually dispensed and their small market  
6           share, I think, is going to have to be the subject of  
7           discovery.

8           I mean, I think we're going to be --

9           THE COURT: Well, I know. I --

08:50:17 10           [Simultaneous crosstalk.]

11           MR. WEINBERGER: -- the dispensing data, so  
12           that we can sort through that and determine what they're  
13           saying about their market share is, in fact, true.

14           But, again, I think that's for another day, but I just  
08:50:29 15           wanted to put that on the record.

16           THE COURT: Well, understood.

17           And I had -- in Track 3, the three major pharmacies  
18           had the ability, had they wished to bring in other  
19           defendants, they chose not to. But the trial would have  
08:50:44 20           been a lot of more complicated had they brought them in. We  
21           certainly wouldn't have gotten it done in the six weeks that  
22           we did, so . . .

23           All right.

24           MR. BOONE: Your Honor, this is Brian Boone  
08:50:55 25           for OptumRx.

1           If I can just add one thing. And I understand that  
2       you're saying that there's going to be discovery about the  
3       PBMs mail-order pharmacies. And that's fine. But it really  
4       is going to show that in each of these bellwether  
08:51:10 5       jurisdictions, we're talking about a tiny, tiny market  
6       share, almost vanishing.

7           THE COURT: Well --

8           MR. WEINBERGER: And I -- but I think it's  
9       important to note, Your Honor -- and, again, this is for  
08:51:20 10      down the road -- this goes to the issue of the scope of  
11      discovery. And we've -- which we litigated in front of  
12      Special Master Cohen extensively. And I would suggest to  
13      you that it will be our position that since we're talking  
14      about knowledge in the first instance and knowledge related  
08:51:42 15      to their duties as dispensers under the CSA, our position is  
16      we're not going to be limited to the dispensing statistics  
17      or data just for bellwethers. But rather, I think we're  
18      going to be -- we should be entitled to see what were their  
19      dispensing numbers across the country because that relates,  
08:52:04 20      again, to their overall knowledge of how inadequate  
21      corresponding responsibility systems can lead to the opioid  
22      epidemic. So --

23           THE COURT: Well, that -- look, I'm going  
24      to -- we addressed in prior bellwethers, the scope of  
08:52:26 25      discovery, and, you know, parties should look at my prior

1 rulings. There're going to be some issues where discovery  
2 is going to be potentially nationwide, and others where it's  
3 going to be local to the jurisdictions -- you know, the  
4 geographic area of each of these four bellwethers. And so  
08:52:49 5 we'll have to address that. All right?

6 So we've done that in prior cases, and we'll do that  
7 here. Where there's a good reason to make it broader, it  
8 will be broader, and when there is not, it won't be. And  
9 I'll consider, you know, burden and costs as well.

08:53:10 10 So, you know, the parties should be meeting and  
11 conferring on that, and ultimately use Special Master  
12 Cohen's help. And if there's a serious dispute, I'll have  
13 to decide it.

14 And that leads to another thing. There was a, you  
08:53:27 15 know, back and forth from the parties' proposals about the  
16 effect of prior rulings, court rulings in the MDL.

17 The PBMs were not party to any of these, you know --  
18 the motions, the briefing, the argument, the decisions. So  
19 they're not technically bound by them. But on the other  
08:53:51 20 hand, they're there. And I think the fairest thing should  
21 be that if the same issue comes up, that the PBMs should  
22 make a showing as to why my ruling was wrong, or that the  
23 facts with respect to them are different and so the rulings  
24 should be different, either to say, you know, they'll get a  
08:54:21 25 crack at saying that my ruling was wrong if they didn't get



1 a crack at it the first time. And I don't think it would be  
2 fair for me to say, well, too bad. They get a crack to show  
3 why it was wrong, or to say, you know, whether you were  
4 right or wrong, the facts with respect to defendant X or Y  
08:54:41 5 is not the same as the facts with us. And so the ruling  
6 with respect to us should be different. So I think that's  
7 the way we'll deal with those.

8 With respect to motions *in limine*, my view is that  
9 decisions on motions *in limine* -- because those are trial  
08:55:03 10 rulings -- those will be made by the transferor court, not  
11 by me.

12 *Daubert* and summary judgment, my inclination now is to  
13 keep those and make those. But since we're more than a year  
14 off, I really don't need to make that decision now, and  
08:55:23 15 if -- I mean, I -- and for prior bellwethers, I -- you know,  
16 I guess for some I didn't and some I did.

17 So my inclination, I think it's -- I think I had more  
18 capacity and experience, and it would be a -- certainly  
19 relieve the burden on my four colleagues around the country  
08:55:44 20 if I do those with my team. But it's well over a year off,  
21 and if I think at that time that it's better to let some or  
22 all of them go to the transferor courts, I'll do that.

23 MR. BOONE: Your Honor, this is Brian Boone  
24 again for OptumRx.

08:56:07 25 Could we just go back briefly to your prior rulings?

1 And I heard what you said. One of the things that we're  
2 struggling with is we haven't been part of the MDL, and we  
3 don't know what we don't know, and we understand that there  
4 are lots of rulings that are not on the docket.

08:56:23 5 THE COURT: I'm not worried about the  
6 discovery rulings, Brian. I'm worried about, you know,  
7 rulings on motions to dismiss, or substantive rulings that  
8 are published. I'm not expecting you to try and pour  
9 through transcripts or millions of orders that aren't  
08:56:41 10 published, all right? I can't imagine those are going to be  
11 significant.

12 MR. BOONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: But I'm talking about the, you  
14 know, the published rulings that were made after thorough  
08:56:53 15 briefing. Everyone knows what they are.

16 Again, you weren't part of it. So I don't think it's  
17 fair for me to say, well, they apply to you, and that's  
18 that.

19 But on the other hand, they're there, and I think if  
08:57:08 20 the same issue comes up, then you've got a -- you know, you  
21 get a crack at showing me why I was wrong a year or two or  
22 three years ago, or, of course, to say, well, the facts with  
23 respect to us are different, and here's why, and so the  
24 rulings should be different because, you know, it's like  
08:57:29 25 distinguishing any case.

1 And, again, you know, Special Master Cohen worked  
2 through lots and lots of discovery issues. And, again, I  
3 mean, the reason why I want the PBMs to think long and hard  
4 about, you know, motions to disqualify, is that once you  
08:57:51 5 start -- I don't know how to put it -- potentially poisoning  
6 the professional relationship among counsel, the whole  
7 enterprise deteriorates. And that doesn't benefit anyone.

8 So that's why I want you to think long and hard before  
9 going down that road. Because this enterprise has only gone  
08:58:18 10 as well as it has because we've had the best lawyers in the  
11 country, and they have 99.9 percent of the time worked very  
12 well professionally while still vigorously, very vigorously  
13 representing their respective clients. And that's the only  
14 reason this MDL is still standing. It's not -- you know,  
08:58:43 15 yeah, I'll give myself a little credit, and I'll give my  
16 team even more credit, but mostly, it's the lawyers. And so  
17 I'm just worried about disrupting that.

18 So those were the things I had.

19 Special Master Cohen, did I leave anything important  
08:58:59 20 off that you think we should raise?

21 And then, obviously, if the parties have anything that  
22 they want to raise, that's fine.

23 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: I had to take myself  
24 off mute.

08:59:16 25 No. I don't think there's anything else. We may have

1 some other discussions with the parties on some fine  
2 details, but I think you got the major points.

3 THE COURT: I wanted to cover a few major  
4 things.

08:59:28 5 So anything from the two PBMs or the plaintiffs that  
6 you want to add or put in?

7 MR. WEINBERGER: Yes. This is Pete Weinberger  
8 on behalf of the plaintiffs.

9 But I'll wait for the PBMs, if you want to step in  
08:59:47 10 first?

11 MR. BOONE: This is Brian Boone for OptumRx.

12 I don't have anything else today, Your Honor.

13 Thanks.

14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Brian.

08:59:59 15 MR. KING: Yes. And this is Patrick King for  
16 Express Scripts.

17 I don't believe I have anything else subject to what  
18 the plaintiffs may have.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

09:00:07 20 MR. WEINBERGER: Then I'm back on the record.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. WEINBERGER: This is Pete Weinberger,  
23 again, for the plaintiffs.

24 A couple of things, Your Honor. I take it from your  
09:00:14 25 discussion that with the schedule that you laid out,

1 particularly with respect to the motion for leave to file  
2 the amended complaint, that we'll then have discussions with  
3 Special Master Cohen about, you know, fitting into a CMO the  
4 usual scheduling of discovery, et cetera, as opposed to  
09:00:41 5 entering that now.

6 THE COURT: Well, I'm not -- I'm going to --  
7 I'm going to -- now that we've had this discussion, Pete,  
8 I'm going to sit down with Special Master Cohen and my team  
9 and see if we can put -- you know, if it makes sense to put  
09:00:58 10 some things together now, or I think some may be able to,  
11 but some, candidly, are going to wait to see what exactly  
12 you're proposing your claims to be and to wait and see what  
13 the -- you know, what the PBMs respond.

14 MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. That's --

09:01:16 15 THE COURT: So we're going to -- we're going  
16 to start -- we're going to start working and put something  
17 together. And I expect there will be something -- something  
18 issued. But it certainly -- things may change depending  
19 on -- I mean, at this point, no one knows what -- what, if  
09:01:36 20 any, additional claims are going to be allowed, all right?

21 I think -- we don't know what claims, additional  
22 claims or new claims or substituted claims you're going to  
23 propose, and then I don't know what the PBMs are going to  
24 say in response and what I'm going to rule.

09:01:54 25 So some of this is still in the air, but I think some

1 things we can probably put in place.

2 MR. WEINBERGER: Understood. Again, Pete  
3 Weinberger.

4 What we would like to do to sort of move things along  
09:02:12 5 and to ripen any disputes that we may have on discovery is  
6 to issue an initial set of interrogatories and request for  
7 production of documents.

8 Obviously, under the rules, there's, you know, time to  
9 respond. And by the time we get -- you know, we put that  
09:02:30 10 together and get it on -- get it over to the defendants, you  
11 know, I think we're going to be, you know, well past the  
12 time frame for filing a motion for leave and for responses.

13 But we want -- we are working on discovery requests,  
14 and we'd like to get them on record so that we can start the  
09:02:56 15 process of having the defense look at them, to do a meet and  
16 confer with them, and, obviously, some will be subject to  
17 how you rule on the amended complaints. But we'd like to  
18 issue that, you know, relatively soon and are interested in  
19 your feedback on that.

09:03:19 20 THE COURT: Well, I'm curious, Pete, how you  
21 can file those before you even file your motion for leave to  
22 file amended complaint. Because at the moment -- I mean,  
23 the only claims you have are the ones that exist in  
24 the complaints that were filed maybe years ago. I haven't  
09:03:41 25 even looked at --

1 MR. WEINBERGER: Right.

2 THE COURT: So don't you at least have to  
3 file -- I mean, you know, leave to amend with your proposed  
4 amended complaints, you can say, look, this is -- these are  
09:03:55 5 the claims we're planning to bring -- we want to bring, and  
6 maybe then you can propound some discovery. I don't see how  
7 you can propound discovery before those are filed.

8 MR. WEINBERGER: Well, that -- well, I mean,  
9 as we've indicated, that we're going to get those motions on  
09:04:10 10 file by December 15th. And I was -- what I'm suggesting --  
11 and maybe I should have been clearer about this -- is that  
12 certainly by the end of the year, we can get our basic  
13 discovery out. And --

14 THE COURT: All right. Well, I don't have a  
09:04:24 15 problem with your -- I mean, unless there's a strong  
16 objection, you can propound it, but you've got to, you know,  
17 you've got to allow enough time, I mean, because -- you  
18 know, it may be that all of the claims you want to bring, I  
19 don't allow you to bring. And that may affect the  
09:04:41 20 discovery, so . . .

21 But I think some of it is going to be basic enough  
22 that it's clearly going to be -- will clearly be necessary.

23 MR. WEINBERGER: Yeah --

24 THE COURT: So I don't have --

25 MR. WEINBERGER: -- that's what I was

1 thinking.

2 THE COURT: So I don't have a -- I don't have  
3 a problem with your propounding initial discovery after you  
4 file the motion for leave to amend.

09:05:07 5 MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. Thank you.

6 And then one other issue, and it is getting into the  
7 weeds a little bit, but as the Court is aware,  
8 Special Master Cohen issued discovery ruling 22, and we  
9 have been getting documents from Optimum and from Express  
09:05:26 10 Scripts per that ruling, principally from litigation that's  
11 occurred in Jefferson County, Missouri.

12 We want to remind the defendants on the record that  
13 the discovery ruling number 22 is broader than just, you  
14 know, private litigation, but encompasses governmental  
09:05:51 15 investigations, and specifically, Congressional  
16 investigations.

17 And, you know, I think it's public that the PBMs have  
18 been subjected to Congressional investigations regarding  
19 their practices, and we just want to remind -- and from our  
09:06:15 20 review of the documents, we have not been getting any  
21 documents associated with those Congressional  
22 investigations.

23 I realize that the ruling talks about opioid-related  
24 investigations, and -- but the fact is that we believe the  
09:06:37 25 investigations that have occurred are broad enough to



1 include opioid -- their conduct vis-à-vis opioid scripts and  
2 formularies associated with opioids. And we just wanted to  
3 put on the record to remind the defendants that DR22  
4 encompasses that.

09:07:02 5 And that's all I have, Your Honor.

6 Thanks.

7 THE COURT: All right. Well, thanks to  
8 everyone. Again, I appreciate all the hard work in the  
9 respective filings. And it's my job to get these four  
09:07:16 10 bellwethers moving forward.

11 And my -- they have a dual purpose. We're getting  
12 them ready for trial, so if we need trials, one, two, three,  
13 or four, they'll be efficient, productive, and informative.  
14 But, of course, I hope that the knowledge that each side  
09:07:41 15 gets in the many months ahead might inform the possibility  
16 of settlement, which is -- that's why we have these two  
17 tracks going simultaneously, litigation and settlement, and  
18 it's worked pretty well so far.

19 So I wish everyone a good holiday, and thank you for  
09:08:03 20 your input today.

21 MR. WEINBERGER: Thank you, Judge.

22 MR. BOONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 - - -

24 (Proceedings adjourned at 9:08 a.m.)

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript  
from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Donnalee Cotone 1st of December, 2023  
DONNALEE COTONE, RMR, CRR, CRC DATE  
Realtime Systems Administrator